REMARKS

Claims 15-34 were previously withdrawn due to the election of Group I. Claims 1 and 8 are amended. Support for the amendments may be found in the specification at least in paragraphs [0077], [0081], [0082] and Figures 4 and 12. No claims are added or cancelled in this paper. Therefore, claims 1-14 are pending. Claim 1 is in independent form.

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,317,658 to Vian ("Vian"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As amended, independent claim 1 recites:

> 1.   A device management system, comprising:
> a plurality of devices, wherein each said device is adapted to perform a device function, wherein each said device function is associated with an input parameter and an output parameter, wherein each said input parameter includes a range of potential input values, wherein each said output parameter includes a range of potential output values, wherein each said output parameter is determined by and associated with at least one said input parameter; and
> a configuration component, said configuration component including an input matrix comprising said input values corresponding to said input parameters and a custom feature matrix comprising operating rules, wherein said input values are selected and set from said range of potential input values to result in a desired said output value within said range of potential output values according to said operating rules, wherein said input matrix is created through a software application. (emphasis added.)

Vian fails to teach or suggest at least "a custom feature matrix comprising operating rules" as recited by amended independent claim 1. Moreover, Vian further fails to teach or suggest "wherein said input values are selected and set from said range of potential input values to result in a desired said output value within said range of potential output values according to said operating rules," as further recited by claim 1.

Rather, Vian discloses a system where:

> vehicle and control input sensors 78 send system state information to the neural network controller 66. The system states are processed by

> the control laws function 72 of the neural network controller 66.
> Based on the control laws, the system states are converted to
> commands for the moments/forces 75 that are desired to best control
> the vehicle. (Vian, col. 4, lines 2-10.)

Vian further discloses that a "neural network controller is trained for all possible contingencies for the target, or on-line system." (Vian, col. 2, lines 10-13.) According to the training, "control effector commands that yield feasible control subsystem forces/moments are calculated based on the generated desired forces/moments, operating conditions, and the predefined limits of the control subsystems." (Vian, col. 4, lines 47-51.) Importantly, in Vian, "the predefined compensation and control laws are determined by the nature of the vehicle and the type of vehicle sensors employed." (Vian, col. 4, lines 43-46; emphasis added). Thus, in contrast to "a custom feature matrix comprising operating rules," Vian discloses "calculated" "effector commands" taking into account "the nature of the vehicle," i.e., based on the vehicle itself, not on any "operating rules."

Similarly, Vian further fails to teach or suggest "wherein said input values are selected and set from said range of potential input values to result in a desired said output value within said range of potential output values according to said operating rules," as recited by amended independent claim 1. In contrast, in Vian "control effector commands . . . are sent to the control subsystems" in response to "vehicle and control input." (Vian, col.4, lines 1-25.) These commands are not sent according to operating rules, but instead according to pre-computed data. (Vian, col. 4, lines 43-46.)

For at least these reasons, Vian fails to teach or suggest at least "a custom feature matrix comprising operating rules" or "wherein said input values are selected and set from said range of potential input values to result in a desired said output value within said range of potential output values according to said operating rules." Thus, Applicants respectfully request for the Examiner's rejection of claim 1, as well as claims 2-14 depending therefrom, to be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Applicants believe no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. 65783-0034 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw. To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made, the fee for which should be charged to this deposit account.

Dated: September 9, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Shelly L. Hokenstad/
Shelly L. Hokenstad
   Registration No.: 59,107
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
Correspondence Customer Number: 10291
Attorney for Applicant